



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,367	03/26/2004	Kevin N. Quiring	10761.1461	2811
81331	7590	02/03/2009	EXAMINER	
Accenture/Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 901 New York Avenue Washington, DC 20001-4413			PARKER, BRANDI P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/811,367

Applicant(s)

QUIRING ET AL.

Examiner

BRANDI P. PARKER

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. The following is a Final Office action in response to communications filed on 10/21/2008. Claims 1, 7-9 and 17-24 have been amended.

Response to Applicant's Remarks

2. Applicant's amendment to claim 1, filed on 10/23/2008, has been fully considered and is persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 USC § 101 has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Examiner's Notes

4. The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as

potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilkinson et al (US 7016936) in view of Patel et al (US 7370004).

1. With respect to claims 1, 9 and 17, Wilkinson teaches

a. interfacing with a plurality of different types of communication channels (column/line 11/40-56);

- b. receiving requests from at least one customer for customer interactions over at least two different types of communication channels (column/line 4/37-43);
- c. identifying the at least one customer (column/line 4/46-50);

Wilkinson does not directly teach a channel-independent processing engine for each customer interaction. However, Patel teaches:

- d. for each requested customer interaction, choosing at least one treatment for processing the customer interaction using a central, channel-independent processing engine (column/line 2/35-38); and
- e. processing the customer interaction by the central, channel-independent processing engine, based on the treatments chosen (column/line 3/7-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the business system of Wilkinson with the ability to use a channel-independent processing engine for each customer interaction as taught by Patel since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

2. As to claims 2, 10 and 18, Patel further teaches the method from claim 1, wherein choosing the at least one treatment is a function of a customer segment, an interaction type and an interaction channel (column/line 3/25-28).

3. Regarding claims 3, 11 and 19, Wilkinson teaches the method from claim 1, further comprising:

f. inserting data correlating to the at least one treatment into a customer intelligence record (column/line 7/20-33); and

g. returning the customer intelligence record to one of the plurality communication channels for instructing the channel on the treatments to present to the customer (column/line 12/42-45).

4. With respect to claims 4, 12 and 20, Wilkinson teaches the method from claim 1, wherein the step of choosing at least one treatment accesses a central repository where treatments have been stored by an independent design tool (column/line 10/41-48).

5. Regarding claims 5, 13 and 21, Patel further teaches wherein the central processing engine processes grouped rules in a hierarchy (column/line 5/61-67).

6. As to claims 6, 14 and 22, Wilkinson teaches the method from claim 1, further comprising sending the at least one treatment to one of the plurality of communication channels via a plurality of services (column/line 11/40-56).

7. Regarding claims 7-8, 15-16 and 23-24, Wilkinson teaches the method from claim 7, wherein the step of leveraging insight about customers from analytical models to derive at least one treatment comprises:

h. extracting customer data for a plurality of customers from at least one database (column/line 11/59-67);

i. training analytical models to predict customer behavior, wherein the analytical models are trained using the customer data extracted from at least one database (column/line 6/66-7/2, 14/4-13);

j. gathering the customer interaction results (column/line 7/2-5); and

k. retraining the analytic models to refine the customer behavior prediction, wherein the analytical models are re-trained using the customer data extracted from at least one database as well as the customer interaction results (column/line 7/10-19; 14/15-25 regarding optimizing the customer behavior models) .

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

9. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **BRANDI P. PARKER** whose telephone number is (571) 272-9796. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs. 8-5pm.

11. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bradley B. Bayat can be reached on (571) 272-6704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRANDI P PARKER/
Examiner, Art Unit 3624

/Bradley B Bayat/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3624